

research, as well as the members of his subcommittee.

Earlier this year, Congresswoman NITA LOWEY and I circulated a congressional letter urging the Appropriations National Security Subcommittee to provide \$175 million for the peer-reviewed breast cancer research program at the Department of Defense, a letter co-signed by 225 of our colleagues. The peer-reviewed breast cancer research program has gained a well-deserved reputation for its innovation and efficient use of resources, with over ninety percent of program funds going directly to research grants. We must continue to increase our investment in this important program.

We must also work to better translate new research findings to clinical applications, both through a greater focus on clinical research and through technology transfer. As Chair of the Technology Subcommittee, I have been working to facilitate technology transfer between government agencies and the private sector. Efforts such as the "missiles to mammograms" project between the Public Health Service, the Department of Defense, the intelligence community, and NASA, are critically important in applying new technologies to the fight against breast cancer.

Access to mammography screening is another critical issue. The Congressional Caucus on Women's Issues had a major victory during the last Congress when the Balanced Budget Act included annual coverage for mammography screening under Medicare.

As of last year, the breast and cervical cancer screening program had provided more than 1.2 million breast and cervical cancer screenings, education, and follow-up services for low-income women across the country. While this program has been very successful, we must ensure that efforts are expanded to better reach disadvantaged and minority populations.

As an increasing number of mastectomies and lymph node dissections are performed as outpatient surgery, Congress should ensure that women receive the hospital care and insurance coverage they need. We must hold hearings and pass legislation to require health plans to provide coverage for a minimum hospital stay for mastectomies and lymph node dissection for the treatment of breast cancer. Congresswoman ROSA DELAURO and Congresswoman SUE KELLY have each introduced legislation that would provide 48 hours of inpatient care following a mastectomy and 24 hours of inpatient care following a lymph node dissection for the treatment of breast cancer. I am a cosponsor and strong supporter of this critical legislation. Women and their doctors—not their insurance companies—should determine whether a shorter stay is sufficient.

These initiatives are just a few of the many important efforts underway to address the critical issue of breast cancer. For as long as I serve in Congress, I will continue to work with my colleagues on programs that will provide fuel for the hopes of patients and scientists alike and move us forward in the battle against breast cancer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WATERS. addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

REPORT ON H.R. 3037, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. YOUNG of Florida, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-370) on the bill (H.R. 3037) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of the special order I am about to give.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

DEBT FORGIVENESS FOR THIRD-WORLD COUNTRIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, today was a very historic day in this body, and Congress has finished its business at a reasonable time. I wish that many more of my colleagues were in town to hear our special order, because it addresses an issue that came up in our foreign operations bill the other day; and that is the issue of debt forgiveness in the developing world.

In the course of a debate on the legislative bill, an appropriations bill like the foreign operations bill, all we had was an hour on the rule and an hour on the bill, which is the regular order. But because so many Members want to express their support or their opposition to the legislation, the most any of us gets to speak is a few minutes if we are lucky if we are ranking member, or one or two if we are not.

The bill covers a wide range of issues. The foreign operations bill is the bill which funds our diplomatic efforts abroad. The pillars of our foreign policy are promoted in that bill: stopping the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, promoting democratic values, growing our economy through exports, looking out for our national se-

curity, and the assistance that we provide for other countries is in the national interest of the United States.

So this is not about charity. It is about acting in our own self interest. It also, though, taps the well of generosity and concern that the American people have to alleviate poverty in the world and to make the world a safer place, promoting our democratic values, which are universal, so that the world is a safer place in which we can raise our children and our grandchildren.

That brings us to the point of, making the world a safer place means making the world a better place for all of the children of the world. I know my colleagues have heard me say the three most important issues facing this Congress are our children, our children, our children. By that, I mean, not only our children in America, but the fate of children throughout the world. They are affected by the economic well-being of the countries in which they live.

Many of the countries in the Third World, particularly in Africa, some in Latin America, mostly all in the southern hemisphere, have been burdened by debt that has been incurred by previous regimes. For instance, in South Africa, there is a heavy debt load that has been carried over from the apartheid government. Now this new government of the last few years has that burden to carry. How can they succeed with this drag on their economies? That is repeated over and over.

I think we have a responsibility in this area because, during the Cold War, the Soviets and the United States excerpted their influence on the continent of Africa. When the Cold War was over, we up and left, leaving the continent awash in weapons and, in many cases, burdened down by debt.

There is a movement afoot. This is not just a U.S. effort to alleviate this debt, this is an international issue. There is a movement afoot in the religious community. Bishop Desmond Tutu, the Nobel Prize winner from South Africa, was well-known to everyone in the world, I believe, a champion of reconciliation in South Africa, is part of something called the Jubilee, Jubilee 2000.

That is an effort to have debt forgiveness in the developing world so that these new emerging democracies can proceed to meet the needs of their people in terms of education and health and the well-being of their people, unburdened by debts, especially those incurred by previous regimes in their countries and not the democratically elected governments that prevail now.

In our foreign operations bill, there had been a request made by President Clinton for several hundred million dollars over a 3-year period to forgive debt in that region. During the debate, it was contended that, oh, forgiving debt in the Third World was just sending checks to these, what did they call them, turbans and tyrants, or something, so that they could then put this

money into Swiss banks and abscond with that money. That is not what we are talking about here. That is not what President Clinton was advocating.

So it was an unfortunate characterization of the purpose of debt forgiveness and the very important initiative that President Clinton was taking. He was doing it on behalf of our own country, but in conjunction with multilateral efforts that have been made by the G-7 and G-8 in order to alleviate debt in the Third World so that these economies could have a chance to prevail and these new democracies would be able to enjoy some of the benefits of democratic reform and market reform in their countries.

So when we ask for this debt forgiveness and this funding for the debt forgiveness, it is part of a multilateral effort which we are one part, and it is in conjunction with efforts that the people in these countries are taking to help themselves.

This is not about charity. It is about cooperation. This is not about something that is only for the benefit of the recipient. This is about initiatives that will redound to the benefit of the American people, both in providing markets for our goods, if we need a pragmatic reason, but also in addressing the concerns that we have about poverty throughout the world, starvation, famines that we would have come in at a later time and spend much more money, never be able to make for up for the human loss of the people that have died and the malnutrition of those who suffer from starvation.

Of course it would also prevent conflict. Any time that we can prevent conflict, I believe that that is our mission, mission of this great country.

I said in the course of the debate that, being from San Francisco and having the privilege to represent that magnificent area in this Congress, I wanted also, any chance I get, to share with my colleagues the message of Saint Francis, who is the patron saint of San Francisco. The song of Saint Francis is our anthem. Everyone is familiar with it, but I do not know if they know it is the song of Saint Francis. It begins: "Make we a channel of thy peace. Where there is a darkness may we bring light. Despair, may we bring love. Hatred, may we bring love."

Well, that is a big order, and we may not be able to do that, but we certainly can be a channel of God's peace to these countries. Helping these countries alleviate poverty and get on with the future and their economic well-being I think is a force for peace and promoting democratic values in those areas.

Therefore, this Jubilee effort, one that is undertaken by the people affected by it, as a way to help them unburden themselves of the debt and alleviate poverty, is very important one.

The President's initiative is a very wise one. The President says that these funds would be used to help alleviate

the debt, forgive the debt if the government itself will spend the money on education and health care for the children, the people of their countries. That is a very important initiative. In fact, nothing is more important than that.

I do not think that most people in America need to be told how important it is for them to have disease controlled where it exists abroad so it does not come into our country. The environmental measures that this money could be used on to improve the health and the air that the people breathe in those areas prevents that pollution from coming into our country.

So, again, it taps the well of good intentions in our country, and it has a practical benefit to us. So, again, the Jubilee 2000 is a very noble effort, alleviating the Third World debt, forgiving it, because there is a good deal of talk about reducing and forgiving some, but we want to eliminate the Third World debt, which will be is a very important initiative that I believe a country as great as ours can cooperate with very readily. It is money very well spent.

Many of our colleagues are interested in this issue, but this being the end of the day, the end of the session for this week and the beginning of the Columbus Day weekend, we start today, and we will have other special orders on this subject, because there simply was not enough time to present the full enthusiasm that we have for this debt relief, debt forgiveness, elimination.

But I am pleased that a very distinguished leader in the Congress and the House of Representatives is here tonight. She has worked her whole life on the alleviation of poverty in our country and throughout the world. She has worked her whole life for economic justice issues. Fortunately for us, she is the Ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy of the Committee on Banking, which is the committee of jurisdiction on the Third World debt. Our committee is the appropriating committee. The committee of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) is the committee of authorization where this issue is being debated right now and an authorization bill is being prepared.

So I am very pleased to yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), an international leader on this issue and a person well positioned to help very much promote the policy and the funding that President Clinton recommended.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased and proud to join the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) here on the floor this evening to talk about a subject that I believe is the number one issue confronting the world today.

□ 1715

I would also like to thank the gentlewoman for all of the years that she has put in not only on the issues of debt re-

lief but on the issues of foreign affairs and foreign assistance and foreign relations.

The gentlewoman has become one of our premier experts, and she has provided leadership to this House. And it is because of the gentlewoman and the knowledge that she brings to these discussions that we are all able to advance and to move forward. So I truly appreciate everything that the gentlewoman has done and the gentlewoman's leadership in pulling together this time tonight for us to further talk about debt relief and these very poor countries who are depending on us to come to their aid and to their assistance.

I am so pleased and proud to be a Member of Congress at this particular time. Yes, there are many frustrating moments; and, yes, there are many disappointing moments, but I am here in this Congress at a time when I see both sides of the aisle coming together around debt relief. I am the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, but I serve on that committee with the chair of that committee, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), a man who is obviously a Republican, and I am obviously a Democrat.

I am considered to be much more liberal; he is considered to be conservative. But when we hear the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) on this issue, and we see the work that he has brought to this issue, it really does make us proud that there are moments and there are periods in this great body of ours where we can put aside our philosophical differences and come together in the most humane fashion to do something good and send out the best messages from us to others about who we are and what we care about.

So the gentlewoman has referenced and referred to Jubilee 2000. This is a wonderful moment and a wonderful time. Just as I and the gentleman from Alabama have come together, and others from both sides of the aisle on the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, on the Committee on International Relations, on the Committee on Appropriations, all over the world various religious denominations have come together as well, and all of these nongovernment organizations, all of these nonprofit organizations, consumer-related organizations have come together all over the world to embrace debt relief.

We have all come to the point in time where we understand that it is absolutely illogical for us to think that many of these countries are able to repay debt that is owed to us and to others. Whether we are talking about bilateral or multilateral debt, many of these nations are spending a disproportionate amount of their revenue trying to make this payment, to the point of tentimes of starving the children and not being able to provide for health

care, not being able to have anything that approaches decent education systems.

So we sit here at a time when the economy is performing rather well, at a time when we are able to spread prosperity, and we are taking advantage of this time to say this is the time to do it. So we are moving forward and everybody is coming on board. As a matter of fact, we had some people who started out saying, well, we can do something; we can do a little bit of this, a little bit of that. And now we have more people moving toward 100 percent. The President of the United States, when he addressed the International Monetary Fund conference that was here in Washington, D.C., made us proud with his commitment to do 100 percent debt relief.

I know not everybody is there. And even on the appropriations subcommittee we do not have the money that has been allocated to the tune of what was asked for by this administration. But I am convinced that we are going to get there. One way or the other we are going to get there. I do believe there is enough of us who are focused, and we are focused on this issue, to be able in negotiations, that I know will take place no matter what has happened on our appropriations bill. I do believe that we will get to negotiations that will help us to understand that there must be more money for debt relief.

I know that there are those who make the argument that somehow we are taking all of the taxpayers' money to give to somebody else. And I think the gentlewoman made the point the other day that it is less than 1 percent.

Ms. PELOSI. It is 6.8 percent that is in the bill. If we did the President's request, it would be .8 percent. Less than 1 percent still.

Ms. WATERS. Less than 1 percent. And I think that should be said over and over again so that we can get rid of the notion that somehow we are bankrupting our country in order to make this very humane gesture.

We see pictures of children with extended bellies; we see pictures of people who live in remote villages who carry water for miles because they do not have running water. We saw, when we traveled to Africa, children in makeshift classrooms who have little in the way of books or materials but who want to learn. We see countries that are confronted with the problem of AIDS, such as we are seeing in Third World countries and in Africa.

Right next door to us, right in our own hemisphere, we see countries that are struggling to make sure that people just have one little piece of bread and maybe a little something to drink. Milk is out of the question for many of these children. So I do not think any of us can be proud that despite that which we do not have, and we would like to have for everybody, we have enough that we can share with these very desperate souls around the globe. And that is what we are all about in America.

One of the things that we are proudest of is the fact that we believe that we are spiritual people; that we believe in a higher being; that we worship in so many different ways, in whatever fashion. We feel it is important for us to worship. But central to all of that is the belief that we can share; that we can help out; that we can extend a helping hand. And how better to demonstrate that than through this wonderful Jubilee 2000.

And what a wonderful name for what we are doing. We are celebrating our humanity. We are celebrating that, no matter what the distances are around this globe, we are one people. We are one people, and we should all care about each other. So this debt relief is one of the most important actions that we can take.

We are going to send a message to Zambia, for example, who is spending one-third of its government revenue to servicing the debt. We are going to send a message to Mozambique, whose debt service payments in 1997 absorbed about half of all government revenue. We are going to send a message to Nicaragua, where over half of the government's revenue was allocated to debt service payments in 1997. We are going to send a message to all of these children that we care.

We are going to proudly attack the fact that almost 200,000 children die annually in Mozambique from preventable illnesses, such as malaria, measles, and respiratory infection; and only half of the rural population has access to safe water. So this is work that we can be proud of. This is work that everybody can take part in.

And, again, I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership, and I am proud to be a member of the House Committee on Banking and Financial Services offering some leadership in this area. And I look forward to the negotiations and the passage of the appropriations line item that will fully fund the bilateral debt relief and to using our leverage at IMF and the World Bank to make sure that we have multilateral debt relief and we work out all of the questions of how we are going to reap the benefit of the gold, through gold sales, in a way that will satisfy everybody and allay the fears about what it means to be involved in utilizing this possibility for helping to pay for this debt relief.

So I really do appreciate the gentlewoman's leadership.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for participating in this special order this evening. But more important, I thank her for her leadership on this issue and the voice that she gives to the concerns that she expressed this evening. They are concerns that she has used every forum at her disposal to espouse this debt relief and poverty alleviation throughout the world.

I did want to reference the gentlewoman's comment about her chairman, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), and his cooperation on this

and also recognize the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH), who introduced a bill to provide debt relief to ensure that funds released go to anti-poverty programs, including education in the beneficiary nations.

So while we have been talking about some level of debt forgiveness all along, and in June the G-7 agreed to cancel up to 90 percent of bilateral debt, President Clinton upped the ante on the poor-country debt relief the end of September when he announced in his speech at the World Bank-IMF annual meeting that the U.S. would forgive 100 percent of the debts owed to the United States.

Of course, we have to have an act of Congress in order to do that. And, hopefully, this Congress will support the bipartisan efforts that have proceeded largely because of the efforts of the gentlewoman from California.

I wanted to just focus, because the gentlewoman brought up the excitement and the enthusiasm that the gentlewoman has for Jubilee 2000, and give a little background on it. We are part of the USA platform for the Jubilee 2000. But before I go into that, the religious community, as the gentlewoman mentioned, is very, very involved in this. In fact, on the subject of debt forgiveness, Pope John Paul, when he met with the President earlier this year, raised the issue when he met with President Clinton in St. Louis.

The Christian Science Monitor has editorialized about this by beginning, "and forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors." And they go on to say that, "The rich predominantly christian industrial nations have had a hard time putting into practice the latter part of the Lord's prayer phrase in regard to the world's poorest countries." They said that at the end of April.

But since that time, with the action of the G-7 and the President's statement the other day, I think we are well on our way to a recognition that the only way that we are going to help these countries reach their fulfillment for their own people and their countries and in our own interest is to forgive the debt.

Jubilee 2000 springs from a biblical tradition. It calls for a jubilee year, and now we have one coming up, the Year 2000. In a jubilee year, slaves were set free and debts were cancelled. As a new millennium approaches, we are faced with a particularly significant time for such a jubilee. Many impoverished countries carry such high levels of debt that economic development is stifled and scarce resources are diverted from health care, from education, and all other socially beneficial programs to make debt service payments.

Imagine having to pay interest on the debt. They are not even paying down the principal; they are just paying interest on the debt instead of educating the children and giving them health care and, as the gentlewoman

said, providing some of the infrastructure necessary to even bring water into their villages much less their homes.

Much of the debt they carry is the result of ill-conceived development, flawed policies that creditors required of recipient countries in exchange for assistance, and shortsighted decisions by their own leaders. Many times these leaders were from previous regimes. So we have Democratic reform in some of these countries, and these new leaders and these fragile democracies are weighted down by debts incurred and funds used up by a previous regime, in many cases that they have ousted.

□ 1730

Much of the borrowing benefited only the elites in the receiving countries. Whereas, the burden of paying the debt is falling upon the most impoverished members of society. Recognizing that these debts are unpayable and exact a great social and environmental toll, the Jubilee 2000 USA Campaign calls for a time of jubilee and cancellation of the debts, and that would be definitive forgiveness of the crushing international debt in situations where countries burdened with high levels of human needs and environmental distress are unable to meet the basic needs of their people; definitive debt cancellation that benefits ordinary people and facilitates their participation in the process of determining the scope, timing, and conditions of debt relief, as well as future direction and priorities for a decent quality of life, definitive debt cancellation that is not conditioned on policy reforms perpetuate or deepen poverty or environmental degradation and acknowledge the responsibility of both lenders and borrowers and action to recover resources that were diverted to corrupt regimes, institutions and individuals.

And finally, establishment of a transparent and participatory process to develop mechanisms to monitor international monetary flows and prevent recurring destructive cycles of indebtedness.

So there is a vision about where these debt forgiveness can take these countries. There is knowledge about how we got to where we were and what we can do to make a difference. There is a plan of action well planned out. And there is an excitement about this that is building consensus in our country and throughout the world, developing a grassroots network, conducting this advocacy campaign. This Jubilee 2000 Campaign is about leadership.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. PELOSI. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I thought since my colleague had given the background and history of Jubilee 2000 that I would just note some of the participants in this coalition that we have around the world on this very important issue. So I am going to call off a few of these names. Maybe I can get most of them in.

The supporters of the Jubilee 2000 Campaign in support of debt relief include the following:

The Pope  
Africa Faith and Justice Network  
Africa Fund  
Africa Policy Information Center (APIC)  
American Friends Service Committee  
Bread for the World  
Catholic Relief Services  
Center of Concern  
Church of the Brethren/Washington Office  
Church World Service (CWS)/National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA  
Columban Justice & Peace Office  
Conference of Major Superiors of Men  
Episcopal Church  
Episcopal Peace Fellowship  
Evangelical Lutheran Church in America  
50 Years Is Enough US Network for Global Economic Justice  
Friends of the Earth (FOE)  
Leadership Conference of Women Religious  
Lutheran World Relief  
Maryknoll Office for Global Concerns  
Medical Mission Sister's Alliance for Justice  
Mennonite Central Committee (MCC)  
Missionary Oblates of Mary Immaculate  
Nicaragua-US Friendship Office  
OXFAM-America  
Preamble Center  
Presbyterian Church/USA  
Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur  
Sojourners  
United Church of Christ  
United Methodist Church  
US Catholic Mission Association  
Washington Office on Africa  
Witness for Peace  
African Methodist Episcopal Church  
Church of the Brethren/General Board  
Church Women United  
Dominican Sister of Hope  
Ecumenical Program on Central America & the Caribbean (EIPCA)  
Fellowship of Reconciliation (FOR)  
Interreligious Foundation for Community Organizations, Inc. (IFCO)  
Lewis Metropolitan C.M.E. Church  
Lutheran World Relief (LWR)  
National Summit on Africa  
NETWORK B A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby  
Progressive National Baptist Convention  
Rainbow-PUSH  
RESULTS USA  
Sister of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul/New York  
Sisters of St. Joseph of Carondelet/Albany Province  
Sisters of St. Joseph/Brentwood, NY Leadership Team  
Sisters of Charity of Leavenworth  
Swedenborgian Church/Social Concerns Education Committee  
Unitarian Universalist Service Committee  
United Methodist Church/General Board of Global Ministries  
Washington Office on Africa

Is that not a wonderful coalition of people both in the United States and from other parts of the world who have joined hands in this great Jubilee 2000 celebration by putting substance in a real way to the word "celebration in jubilee" in this wonderful push that we have to relieve the debt of the world?

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, that is a wonderful list.

I was taught by some of those organizations that my colleague has named, and we all have benefitted from their grassroots activism on it.

Many of those same organizations support, for example, microlending,

which benefits alleviation of poverty among women and lifts up families and increases literacy rates, etcetera. So we are talking about new approaches, and that is what we need as we go into the new millennium.

My colleague listed those names, and I just wanted to reference two other points before we close here. And that is, I am going to quote my colleague as she joined the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) and our own ranking member the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) who has been a leader on this issue, too; the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) my colleague referenced, the chair of the subcommittee; and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) in introducing the debt relief for poverty reduction act:

"Relieving the unsustainable debt burdens of the world's poorest countries is one of the foremost humanitarian and moral challenges of our time. Debt relief can also benefit the U.S. economy."

So, again, it is helping us as we help others.

I want to also quote, this is a Jubilee Call for Debt Forgiveness. This pamphlet is put out by a statement by the Administrative Board of the U.S. Catholic Conference. This is the Catholic Conference of Bishops in the United States, the voice of the church in the United States, and it is the Catholic Campaign on Debt.

In here, among other things, the bishops say, "The coming of the great Jubilee in 2000 offers us a time to make new beginnings and to right old wrongs. Pope John Paul, II, has called repeatedly for forgiving international debt as a sign of true solidarity. In this statement, we join our voice to his to inform the public about the moral urgency of the debt question and to offer some considerations about responding to it."

So, as I said before, it is the vision, the knowledge, the plan of action, and the enthusiasm and excitement that is being engendered by this.

Again, this is in the context of these countries taking actions to help themselves. We must lend a helping hand. We cannot ignore the efforts that they are making, if not for political reasons or economic reasons that benefit the United States, but for the children.

Those of us who profess to value our religion know that the gospel of Matthew is one that we carry heavily on our shoulders, to feed the hungry and to minister to the needs of the least of God's brethren.

OXFAM is another organization that is in their pamphlet, Education Now: Breaking the Cycle of Poverty, talks about debt and education and it is much easier to have the education without the debt.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman mentioned and I failed to mention but I must underscore her recognition of the chairman of the full committee the gentleman from Iowa

(Mr. LEACH). I do not know if there could have been anyone else that could have executed this in the way that he has done.

As my colleague knows, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) is a highly respected Member of this House who has given leadership to that overall committee on many very important issues, none more important than this one. And it is because of his patience, it is because of the high esteem in which he is held in this House that he was able to work so well with all of these groups that make up Jubilee 2000.

So I would like to thank my colleague for the special recognition she has paid to him and to say on my behalf that the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) probably will mark this success that we are going to have as one of the highlights of his career.

I know that he has done many things and he has been involved in many complicated pieces of legislation that have had far-reaching effects. But this molding and shaping and moving of debt relief for the world and the countries that need it so desperately will go down in history as one of the most important efforts that he has made.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague in saluting the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman LEACH). I do not know where he is on total debt forgiveness, but I know that he is a champion of debt relief. I do not want to speak for him to associate him here with the Jubilee 2000. But he certainly has taken us a long way down the road.

Those of us who are concerned about this issue, as my colleagues knows, are very blessed to have him in this position that he is in because he understands financial institutions, international financial institutions, but he is also an expert on foreign policy and what is in the national interest of our country. So his two main committee assignments converge on this issue and his understanding of that will serve the poor people of the world well.

And the ranking member on the committee the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) has a very clear understanding of the foreign policy implications. He understands the financial institutions. But he also understands the domestic situation in the United States. That is why I was so pleased that he joined the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman LEACH) and others of us to meet with representatives of the IMF, the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, the Treasury Department to impress upon them how important the alleviation of poverty is to Congress in a bipartisan fashion.

I was very pleased with the comments that the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) made that day, which the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) the ranking member made that day and the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman LEACH) to the representatives of the banks so that they knew that this thrust that we had about alleviating poverty and pro-

viding for the humanitarian needs should be the thrust of the actions of the international financial institutions in addition to the debt forgiveness.

This effort is bipartisan. It is bicameral. We have champions in the Senate, as well. And it now has the added benefit of the President of the United States weighing in very heavily on this issue, again speaking to the international financial institutions last week when they were in Washington.

It is also an international effort. It is ecumenical. All of the religions are joining in and working together. I cannot think of another issue that had such consensus across the board among so many divergent groups.

So where there is a will there is, hopefully, a way for us to do this; and in doing so, we will make a very serious difference.

Let us hear it. Bravo for Jubilee 2000 to use this landmark, this milestone, this date of the year 2000 for us to say, okay, we have talked about it a long time. We have nipped at the edges about it for a number of years. Now let us just put it behind us so that we and these countries can go into the next year, the next century, the next millennium with a chance of doing the right thing by the people and especially the children.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) who really has been working on this for a long time, he preceded me and once was the chair of the subcommittee and he has been working very closely with the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) working at some very important details of shaping and forming the final legislation in this effort. So I want to say bravo to them.

Once again, let me just conclude my remarks by saying bravo to my colleague for all the time and effort that she has spent even until tonight staying late to take this issue up. And, of course, she certainly did not have to add one more hour to her schedule.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for that. I am glad that she mentioned the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) because he is a champion on this.

There are many champions on the House on both sides of the aisle on this issue, and we are going to have to have another special order so that they can speak to the issue and, if not, that we can speak to their efforts. We are grateful to all of them for what they have done.

I thank the gentlewoman for joining me here this evening.

Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of ecumenism, of bipartisanship, and in helping the poor people of the world, as we help ourselves, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1745

#### AMERICA'S DIGITAL FUTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. TAUZIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I do not often do special orders, but something recently occurred that has caused me to come to the floor of the House today and to announce a very special project that will occur on Monday in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, at Louisiana State University.

And many of the Members of the House have recently seen copies of this map published in the local newspaper, The Hill, and the local newspaper, the Congress Daily and others in this area, and it is a map that indicates the U.S. Internet POPs, the points of presence of broadband hubs in America.

What is interesting about the map is that an awful lot of our country does not have the presence of an Internet, a broadband high-speed hub, located on their map. The map becomes more interesting when it is compared to a report that was recently published on the new economy index, an attempt by the Democratic Leadership Council to identify the States of our country where the high technology or digital economy has really arrived and is achieving great results for its citizens and the places around our country where the high technology economy, the digital economy, the Internet economy, however you want to call it, has yet to arrive and may be very slow in arriving.

The State new economy index ranked the States of America in terms of the high-technology connects, the connectivity of our people, of homes, of businesses, to the Internet and the presence of broadband capable structures that are going to allow those States and those economies to do well in the new millennium.

In that list of States are listed, of course, the real winners, the States where the high technology economy has really arrived and where high technology hook-ups, the connections to the Internet, the capacity of the systems are really very present. The top two States are Massachusetts and California. The lower States, the lower 25 States include Georgia, Hawaii, Kansas, Maine, Rhode Island, North Carolina, Tennessee, Wisconsin, Ohio, Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, Indiana, South Carolina, Kentucky, Oklahoma, Wyoming, Iowa, South Dakota, Alabama, North Dakota, Montana, my own State of Louisiana, West Virginia, Arkansas and Mississippi. We are ranked 47th in Louisiana in high-technology connects.

Now why did I find that so alarming, and why this event in Baton Rouge next Monday?

I found it so alarming because, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Trade, and Consumer Protection of the Committee on